REMARKS

Claims 1-14, 19 and 20 were previously pending. With this amendment new Claims 21-44 have been added. Therefore, Claims 1-14, 19-44 are now pending.

Claims 1, 5, 7-10, 19 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Demas (US 2004/0073930). Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Demas in further view of Yap (US 2002/0092021). Claims 3, 4 and 12-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Demas in further view of Love et al. (US 2004/0201544). Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Demas. Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Demas (US 2004/0073930) in further view of Yap et al. (US 2001/0033736).

Demas

Demas discloses an integrated receiver with dual channel transport stream decoding and delivery which allows display of two decoded audio-video signals on independent monitors. (Demas, Abstract).

With reference to Fig. 4, Demas further recites:

> *[0058] FIG. 4 illustrates a communication network where one or more encoders 100 transmit multiple signals 174 to a decoder 170 for servicing multiple output signals for simultaneous display on independent display devices 196 , 198 . As depicted, the present invention is capable of servicing multiple satellite channels. Specifically, it can receive at least two satellite input signals and produce two television output signals. Both of the output signals may be digitally based. The output signals can be displayed on two separate displays 196 , 198 , or can be displayed together on a single display in a "picture in a picture" mode.*
> ...
> *[0060] In an integrated circuit embodiment of the present invention, decoding system 170 may receive signals 174 from two separate satellite inputs. Alternatively, the integrated circuit may receive multiple channels or programming from a single satellite input. The video and audio decoding components of the integrated circuit (including the transport and audio/video decoding processors and the DACs) operate to service these two channels under control of independently generated clock signals that and each synchronized to the respective program clocks of the channels being decoded.* (Demas, [0058]-[0060]

With reference to Fig. 8, Demas recites:

FIG. 8 illustrates an embodiment of the video decoder processor 508 depicted in FIG. 5 , where video decoder processor 800 performs MPEG video decoding on up to two video streams, and provides decoded video data to the graphics engine 510 . ... . Primary video display feed 822 is used to render the decoded video from 4:2:0 into 4:2:2 format, which is then available as an HD/SD video feed for a first display device, such as a first television. (Demas, [0087]-[0088])

With reference to Fig. 9, Demas recites:

[0092] As illustrated in FIG. 9 , there are two scalers (852 , 854), two capture paths (860), two paths to display video from memory 864 (called video windows), and two video output paths (856 , 858). In addition, primary and secondary graphics input are provided for input to the video output and compositor units. In one embodiment, the graphics engine 510 pipelines multiple graphics streams when multiple channels are simultaneously decoded and displayed by the decoding system 500 . As shown in FIG. 9 , each of the scaler, capture and output blocks has the ability to select from various inputs. (Demas, [0092])

Claim 1

Claim 1 recites:

A method for displaying first, second and third video stream information from a video player, the method comprising:

detecting the first video stream and associated first stream identification indicating that the first stream is a left stream;

detecting the second video stream and associated second stream identification indicating that the second stream is a center stream;

detecting the third video stream and associated third stream identification indicating that the third stream is a right stream;

detecting a first display device and associated first display device identification indicating that the first display device is to a left location;

detecting a second display device, and associated second display device identification indicating that the second display device is a center location;

detecting a third display device and associated third display device identification indicating that the third display device is a right location;

directing the video streams to the display devices in a first assignment by using the identifications and positions so that the first stream is displayed on the first display device, the second stream is displayed on the second display device, and the third stream is displayed on the third display device to result in a panoramic view that includes three different portions of a same scene, wherein each portion is displayed on a different one of the first, second and third display devices; and

accepting a signal from a user input device to modify the directing of the video streams to the display devices to produce a different assignment of streams to display devices.

Demas fails to teach or suggest multiple features of Claim 1, as well as the combination of features recited in Claim 1.

In rejecting Claim 1, the Office Action appears to merely repeat the exact language from the rejection of Claim 1 made in the May 13, 2008 Office Action, and fails to address either the amendments or remarks made in Applicant's November 10, 2008 Amendment. As similarly discussed in the November 10, 2008 Amendment, Demas fails to expressly or inherently disclose left, center, and right, stream identifications. Demas further fails to expressly or inherently disclose display devices identifications indicating that devices are to left, center, and right locations, and so further fails to expressly or inherently disclose at least the following features:

detecting the first video stream and associated first stream identification indicating that the first stream is a left stream;

detecting the second video stream and associated second stream identification indicating that the second stream is a center stream;

detecting the third video stream and associated third stream identification indicating that the third stream is a right stream;

detecting a first display device and associated first display device identification indicating that the first display device is to a left location;

detecting a second display device, and associated second display device identification indicating that the second display device is a center location;

detecting a third display device and associated third display device identification indicating that the third display device is a right location;

Further, because Demas does not disclose directing video streams to left, center, and right, display devices to provide a panoramic view, Demas fails to expressly or inherently disclose the following features:

directing the video streams to the display devices in a first assignment by using the identifications and positions so that the first stream is displayed on the first display device, the second stream is displayed on the second display device, and the third stream is displayed on the third display device to result in a panoramic view that includes three different portions of a same scene, wherein each portion is displayed on a different one of the first, second and third display devices

Still further, because Demas fails to disclose enabling a user to modify stream assignments as claimed, Demas further fails to disclose:

accepting a signal from a user input device to modify the directing of the video streams to the display devices to produce a different assignment of streams to display devices.

Instead, with reference to Figs. 4, 8, and 9, Demas discloses a receiver with dual channel transport stream decoding and delivery which allows display of two decoded audio-video signals on monitors. No mention is made of left, center, and right stream identifications or of display devices identifications indicating that devices are to left, center, and right locations.

In addition to the lack of teaching of each of the above-recited features of Claim 1, Demas also fails to teach or suggest the combination of features recited in Claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of amended Claim 1 and any claims that depend therefrom.

Claim 9

Dependent Claim 9 is believed to be in condition for allowance over the cited art at least for the same reasons as its base claims, as well as its unique patentable features.

In addition, Claim 9 recites "The method of claim 7, wherein the broadcast includes information from a cable transmission." The Office Action, in rejecting Claim 9 as being anticipated by Demas, alleges that Demas, as paragraph [0008], discloses the foregoing feature. However, paragraph [0008] is in the Related Art section of Demas. Demas does not disclose, for example, that display different transport channels received via cable are displayed on different display devices.

Claim 19

Dependent Claim 19 is believed to be in condition for allowance over the cited art at least for the same reasons as its base claims, as well as its unique patentable features.

In addition, Claim 19 recites "The method of claim 1, wherein the panoramic view is of a music video, the method further comprising: accepting signals from the user

input device to display a specific band member on the first display device, an overall stage view on the second display device and a close-up of a musician's hands playing an instrument on the third display device."

In rejecting Claim 19 as being anticipated by Demas, rather than reference the language of Claim 19, the Office Action appears to inadvertently recite the language of previously cancelled Claim 15 and fails to address the features of Claim 19.

Applicant respectfully notes that Demas, which fails to mention a view of a band member, a stage view, or a close-up view, as claimed fails to disclose accepting signals from the user input device to display a specific band member on the first display device, an overall stage view on the second display device and a close-up of a musician's hands playing an instrument on the third display device, as claimed.

Claim 20

Claim 20 recites "The method of claim 1, wherein the panoramic view is of a sporting event, the method further comprising: accepting signals from the user input device to display a particular player on a fourth display screen and to display performance statistics on a fifth display screen."

In rejecting Claim 20 as being anticipated by Demas, rather than reference the language of Claim 20, the Office Action appears to inadvertently recite the language of previously cancelled Claim 18 and fails to address the features of Claim 20.

Applicant respectfully notes that Demas, which fails to mention displaying a player on a fourth display screen or displaying performance statistics of a fifth display screen fails to disclose the features of Claim 20.

Claims 2-8, and 10-14

Dependent Claims 2-8, and 10-14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a). Dependent Claims 2-8, and 10-14 are each believed to be in condition for allowance over the cited art at least for the same reasons as Claim 1, as well as their unique patentable features.

New Claims

New Claims 21-44 are supported by the specification and do not add new matter. Additionally, Claims 21-44 are each believed to be patentably distinct over the cited art. Consideration and prompt allowance of the new claims is respectfully requested.

No Disclaimers or Disavowals

Although the present communication may include alterations to the application or claims, or characterizations of claim scope or referenced art, Applicant is not conceding in this application that previously pending claims are not patentable over the cited references. Rather, any alterations or characterizations are being made to facilitate expeditious prosecution of this application. Applicant reserves the right to pursue at a later date any previously pending or other broader or narrower claims that capture any subject matter supported by the present disclosure, including subject matter found to be specifically disclaimed herein or by any prior prosecution. Accordingly, reviewers of this or any parent, child or related prosecution history shall not reasonably infer that Applicant has made any disclaimers or disavowals of any subject matter supported by the present application.

Please charge any additional fees, including any fees for additional extension of time, or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 11-1410.

Respectfully submitted,

KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP

Dated: July 24, 2009

By: _____

David N. Weiss
Registration No. 41,371
Attorney of Record
Customer No. 20995
(310) 551-3450

7506703
072209